



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/642,674	08/19/2003	Dong-ki Hong	1293.1800 3494		
21171 STAAS & HA	7590 03/19/2007 LSEY LLP	· EXAMINER			
SUITE 700			CHU, KIM KWOK		
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2627		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)	-
HONG ET AL.	
Art Unit	
2627	
	HONG ET AL. Art Unit

	Kim-Kwok CHU	2627	
••	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY	FILED 21 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The re this ap places a Require p	ply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of oplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affice the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in cuest for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply multiplication of the continuation is a compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b)	ne period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forthe event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TV	raminer Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE VO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
have been file under 37 CFF set forth in (b)	time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 at is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply origing above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dating earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). APPEAL	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
filing tl	otice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to see of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 3 NTS	avoid dismissal of th	
3.	proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief,		ecause
	They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOT hey raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	ΓE below);	
(c) 🔲	They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially recappeal; and/or	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
	They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4 [Tho a	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). mendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	maliant Amandment	DTOL 224)
	cant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	impilant Americinent (P10L-324).
6. Newly	y proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, lowable claim(s).	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. 🛛 For pu how th The st	rrposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ⊠ will not be entered, or b) □ will be new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. atus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: (s) allowed:	l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
8. 🔲 The af becau	fidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a No se applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidav ot earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
entere	fidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the d because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appears a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
	affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. 🛛 The r	equest for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in Continuation Sheet.	condition for allowar	ice because:
	the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
•			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

With respect to the independent Claims 1, 5 and 7, Applicant does not agrees that the prior art (U.S. Patent 6,282,161) of Son's optimum tilt adjusting values are stored in the memory (page 5 of the Remarks, lines 14 and 15). For example, Applicant states that Son's tilt control value is calculated at the recording position by interpolation with reference to the outputs S inrec and S outrec stored in the memory (page 5 of the Remarks, lines 18 and 19). Accordingly, Son obtains the tilting adjusting values by calculating (interpolating) a tilt angle if no tilt angle is found in the memory same as Applicant's tilt angle in his Claim 1, lines 5 and 6. With respect to correct the tilt of the disc, both Applicant and the prior art of Son use a calculated tilt angle if the tilt angle is not found in the memory (See Applicant's Claim 1. last paragraph). In other words, with respect to Applicant's Claims 1 and 7, even if the prior art of Son's tilt angle is repeatly calculated every time when a tilt control is needed. Son still teaches Applicant's limitation in Claim 1 where if the tilt angle is not found in the memory, the tilt of the disc is corrected using the calculated tilt angle.

On the other hand, with respect to Applicant's Claim 5, Applicant merely claims a memory that stores a tilt angle which has no limitation on when and how to obtain it. Therefore, the prior art of Son can obtain the tilt angle repeatly wth interpolation values stored in the memory.

Examinar: (in CHU (571) 272-7585

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINÉR